DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 817 88 EA 004 536

AUTHOR	Sergiovanni, Thomas J.
TITLE	What Kinds of Objectives for Supervisors?
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	11 Nov 71
NOTE	10p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; *Leadership Qualities; *Objectives; *Supervisors; *Supervisory Activities; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the kinds of objectives that supervisors should pursue and proposes an approach that emphasizes human resource development and organizational enrichment as proper emphases for modern supervisors. The author illustrates the advantages of his approach over traditional and contemporary supervisory approaches by considering four major problems that supervisors and administrators face -- change, control, motivation, and leadership. (Page 6 is not available due to a questionable copyright.) (JF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AUG 23 1972

ED 066817

What Kinds Of Objectives For Supervisors?

by

Thomas J. Sergiovanni

Presented at

Supervision of Instruction
Symposium 1:

Performance Objectives and the Supervisor
November 11, 1971

Cuyahoga County Instructional Supervision Study
Richard L. Petersohn, Director
7540 Grand Division Avenue
Garfield Heights, Ohio 44125

The work presented or herein reported was performed pursuant to a grant from the Ohio Department of Education, ESEA Title III Office. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Ohio Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Ohio Department of Education should be inferred.

EA 004 536

WHAT KINDS OF OBJECTIVES FOR SUPERVISORS?

Thomas J. Sergiovanni

Symposium paper, Cuyahoga Instructional
Supervision Study, Cleveland, Ohio
November 11, 1971

WHAT KINDS OF OBJECTIVES FOR SUPERVISORS?

Thomas J. Sergiovanni

The supervisory relationship can be differentiated from the administrative relationship in a number of ways. Supervisor, for example, emphasizes people, change, dependency and growth. That is, when one chooses to behave in a supervisory way, he focuses primarily on people, is involved in bringing about change of some kind, is dependent upon the indentification, acceptance, commitment and hard work of these people for success, and focuses not only on the content of change but sees as a major thrust the continued growth and development of people with whom he works. Now this is a complex enterprise which requires careful planning by supervisors. Planning in turn involves goal setting and objective seeking. Indeed the very nature of the supervisory relationship is such that supervision by objectives (SBO) gets an obvious endorsement. SBO becomes even a more obvious necessity when we are asking teachers to become more conscious of objective seeking and setting. The important question is not SBO, yes or no, but what kinds of objectives should supervisors pursue? Let me share with you two assumptions which I hold about supervision.

1. The traditional and contemporary emphasis on instructional leadership for supervisors is inadequate and misleading.

2. There is an overemphasis on supervisors working to provide direct leadership as opposed to working to generate leadership among all those who work in the school.

Let us develop this inadequacy and misdirection in traditional and contemporary supervisory approaches as we consider four major problems which super - visors and administrators face; the change problem, the control problem, the motivation problem, and the leadership problem. I will thus propose an approach which emphasizes human resource development and organizational enrichment as proper emphases for modern supervision. The kinds of objectives which supervisors should pursue come primarily from this orientation rather than from traditional conceptions of the supervisor as an instructional leader. Let us consider briefly the four major problems.

The Change Problem

One major aspect of the change problem is the schools tendency to focus on bureaucratic change rather than internalized change. Bureaucratic changes in schools differ from internalized changes in that they are manifested in structures rather than in behavior. Introducing IPI programs, adopting the open education plan, family grouping, revamping the social studies curriculum, team teaching plans and differentiated staffing patterns are examples of only bureaucratic changes unless their presence and use with youngsters is accompanied by changes in attitudes and behaviors of teachers. Indeed all of us are familiar with the introduction of bureaucratic innovations which changed little that mattered in the way teachers

approached their work or in the experiences which were provided for youngsters. This same principle applies to less dramatic innovation such as changing a teaching format, working to "open up" a teacher, or in other ways working to improve general teaching performance in a typical supervisory relationship. Bureaucratic changes in this sense are those "imposed" from above and range from explicit requirements to more subtle supervisory cues.

Whether a change or innovation is internalized or not depends upon the level and quality of identification teachers have with the proposed change. Seven such levels of identification (commitment, cooperation, support, acceptance indifference, apathy, protest, slowdown) are related to approaches to supervision and type of change being internalized by teachers, then the level of teacher identification with the change required ranges from cooperation to commitment. If only a bureaucratic change is required, then one need only seek teacher identification ranging from support to indifference. Certain approaches to supervision tend to build identification at one level and others at another. Traditional instruction leadership patterns most often result in acceptance and indifference while job enrichment approaches which emphasize human resource development, build cooperation and commitment to change.

The Control Problem

Traditional instructioanl leadership patterns expressed by administrators, curriculum developers and coordinators, and supervisors often tend to emphasize what teachers do rather than what they accomplish. Since much if not all of the major planning, goal setting, curriculum organizing, and evaluating is already done for teachers by curriculum workers, administrators, supervisors, textbook writers, workbook developers, test makers, educational media specialists, and the like, teachers become increasingly concerned with doing things right rather than doing right things. The focus of evaluation is often on how well teachers are doing something, rather than how appropriate is that which they do. Teachers need to be responsible for achieving agreed-upon goals and objectives, not for covering an approved curriculum or for administering students' progress through a structured curriculum over which both teacher and student have so little control.

A word of caution about objectives. Common sense dictates that objectives for teachers and students need to be viewed more broadly than the present push for instructional objectives. Indeed instructional objectives are important but not enough. At least two other kinds of objectives need also to be pursued---- expressive and informal. As Elliot Eisner describes:

> "Expressive objectives differ considerably from instructional objectives. An expressive objective does not specify the behavior the student is to acquire after having engaged in one or more learning activities. An expressive objective describes an educational encounter: It identifies a situation in which children are at work, a problem with which they are to cope, a task they are to engage in--but it does not specify what form that encounter, situation, problem, or task they are to learn. An

Major supervisory style	Strategy	Levels of teacher identification	Effectiveness level
Job enrichment	Human resource development	Commitment Cooperation	Usually improved
Traditional instructional leadership	Human relations	Support Acceptance Indifference	Often unchanged
Classical management	Command, monitor, and check	Apathy Protest Slowdown	Usually decreased

Internalized Change ↑

↓ Bureaucratic Change

Figure 1.--Supervisory Style, Teacher Identification and Educational Change

expressive objective provides both the teacher and the student with an invitation to explore, defer or focus on issues that are of peculiar interest or import to the inquirer." [1]

1 Elliot Eisner, "Instructional and Expressive Educational Objectives: Their Formulation and Use in Curriculum." In AERA Monogram Series on Curriculum Evaluation: Instructional Objectives, Vol. 3, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969, pp. 15-16.

Informal objectives are derived from a class of purposes and activities which have value whenever they occur. The development of personal meanings in learning, intrinsic satisfaction in motivation, interpersonal enjoyment in interaction, and love of self and others in life are desirable whenever they occur in school settings. Add to these more cognitively oriented process goals such as exploring, feeling, sensing, sorting, clarifying, creating, and the like, and we begin to sense the flavor of informal objectives. Informal and unpredictable, when they do occur they are nutured and valued. [2]

2 See, for example, Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971, Ch. 14.

The Motivation Problem

A primary goal of supervision ought to be to increase the intrinsic attraction of teaching so that levels of commitment increase and teachers are therefore motivated to work willingly and effectively. However, overly developed and refined curriculum formats which are much in vogue today work against building motivation based on intrinsic job satisfaction. As the curriculum becomes more refined, standarized, sequenced, and coordinated, so does the job of teaching. The more refined the curriculum, the less able are teachers and students to make decisions and consequently, classroom flexibility is reduced. Indeed teaching changes from a total role which includes goal seeking and setting, planning, developing, and doing to a limited role in which set procedures and formats are implemented. Such decreases in the intrinsic value of work often lowers teacher identification from cooperation and commitment to at best acceptance, indifference, and apathy. The effect on students is likely to be similar. High cooperation and commitment, two indicators of intrinsic satisfaction at work, come from jobs which have built into them opportunities for teachers to experience continuous personal and professional growth, to satisfy their needs for achievement of worthwhile objectives which they set, to experience success, to feel genuinely competent as a result of this achievement and success, to accept major responsibility for their own work, and to earn recognition for meritorious performance. Indeed these same relationships hold as well for students.

The Leadership Problem

Leadership functions of most supervisory positions include planning objectives, goals, strategies, programs, and policies; organizing methods, materials, equipment, and people; leading by instructing, mediating, communicating, developing, delegating, and motivating; and controlling by measuring, evaluating, and correcting. Teachers and students on the other hand respond to this planning, organizing, and leading by doing or implementing the instructional program and then by submitting to controls which measures effectiveness. This approach to leadership is suggested in the lower right-hand quadrant of Figure 2. (The quadrants are formed by two axis, one representing the extent to which the teacher, the other student, is an active contributor to decisions regarding curriculum content and instructional formats of a given class). Here teacher contributions to class activity are reasonably strong but limited. For example, all students may be required to study long division before Christmas of the fourth grade or to learn how to write a business letter during the sixth grade but the choice of materials, methods, and approaches, within approved limitations, is largely up to the teacher not the textbook writer, the curriculum developer, or the supervisor.

The upper right-hand quadrant, characterized by teacher and student autonomy and involvement, represents a job enrichment approach to supervision. Here teachers and students assume major responsibility for planning, organizing, and controlling the learning environment with supervisors providing leadership (instructing, mediating, communicating, developing, delegating, and motivating) which supports this effort. Since teacher and student envolement in setting goals and in planning work is high, commitment and intrinsic motivation are assured. These in turn are likely to result in high performance by teachers and students as they pursue instructional, expressive, and informal goals.

The upper left-hand quadrant in many respects resembles the grand progressive era which characterized American education in the thirties. This is indeed an attractive approach but one which is limited because of the passive role assigned to the teacher. The job enrichment approach assumes that teachers and students in partnership and as active interventionists in the learning setting are better able to achieve maximum effectiveness than one or the other.

The least satisfactory and most dehumanizing approach to schooling and supervision is represented in the lower left-hand quadrant. This quadrant contains a nonleadership approach which many observers feel characterizes a large percentage of American schools. Here the controlling force is the textbook, the highly structured and sequenced curriculum and other materials which for the most part determine class and school goals and objectives, decide pacing, sequencing, and scope of instruction, and so on. Teachers and students need only follow directions. Supervisors on the other hand see to it that directions are followed. Frequently settings described in the lower right-hand quadrant have a tendency to evolve into or drift into this quadrant. We usually joke of this change when we refer to the teacher whose last ten years of teaching are exact replications of her fifth year or of another who after ten to twenty years of teaching only has one year of experience. In some respects this quadrant simplifies or makes easy the job of teaching but makes more difficult the job of keeping control of students, of discipline, and so on,

for the typical student response is largely indifference, apathy, protest, and slowdown. Soon teachers respond similarily.

The change problem, control problem, motivation problem, and leadership problem are well within the capabilities of most supervisors and schools to solve. The key to the solution lies, I believe, in a shift on emphasis from supervision attempting to assume direct control over and responsibility for the curriculum, its development and implementation, to assuming control over and responsibility for the development and nuturance of an open and healthy organizational climate. Such a climate would build identification for and commitment to internalized change, increase the supervisor's control over bringing about school effectiveness as opposed to control over what people do, nurture intrinsic satisfaction in work for teacher, and facilitate the emergence of instructional leadership from within the staff.

What kinds of objectives for supervisors are suggested by an emphasis on the development of an open and healthy climate in a school? We are lucky that much work has already been done in mapping the dimension of organizational health.

See, for example, the work of Andrew Halpin and Don Croft in the development of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire as summarized in Andrew Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, N.Y.: MacMillan, 1967, and the work of Matthew Miles on the dimensions of organizational health as summarized in his paper, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," Change Processes in the Public Schools. The University of Oregan, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Eugene, Oregon.

I want to share with you one approach which I believe has tremendous potential for helping supervisors plan, set goals, develop strategies, and indeed to evaluate their own effectiveness as they work to build a climate of effectiveness in school. This approach offers for the first time an integrated research-based system of supervision applicable to schools. The approach was developed by Rensis Likert and his associates at the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan.

See, for example, Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961 and Likert's The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

I cannot possibly develop this approach in great detail within the limitations of a symposium paper. Nevertheless, let me briefly (and unfortunately too simply) sketch out the basic ideas behind this approach to supervision and also to draw your attention to the Profile of Organizational Characteristics which is attached to this paper. The Profile is most illustrative for the items describe what the focus of supervision—indeed the objectives which supervisors should pursue--should be. At the same time, the Profile provides, a handy means for supervisors to assess

what needs to be done and to measure how successful they are in accomplishing these objectives.

The responses to each item are divided into four categories—those associated with System 1, System 2, System 3, or System 4 approaches to supervision. Very briefly, the major principles of the approach are as follows:

If a Supervisor Has:

a well-organized plan of action,
high performance goals,
and knows the technical aspects of his job,

And if the Supervisor Supervises Using:

Systems 1 or 2, that is:	System 4, that is:
a. Has negative and distrustful assumptions about teachers and their willingness to work.	Has positive and trustful assumptions about teachers and their willingness to work.
b. Relies heavily on external control and position authority.	Relies heavily on intrinsic control and ability authority.
c. Uses mostly man-to-man supervisory techniques.	Uses group supervisory techniques.
d. Decides the goals and objectives of the school program.	Works to build identity and commitment to school goals.
e. Relies heavily on rules, regulations, and status systems.	Relies heavily on developing people.
f. Assumes major responsibility for exerting direct instructional leadership.	Helps to facilitate the emergence of leadership in the teaching staff.

His Faculty Will Display:

1. Less group and school loyalty.	Greater group and school loyalty.
2. Lower performance goals.	Higher performance goals.
3. Less identification and commitment.	Greater identification and commitment.
4. An undue interest in the conditions of work and other extrinsic factors.	More interest in the work itself and other intrinsic factors.
5. Feelings of unreasonable pressure.	Less feelings of unreasonable pressure.
6. Less favorable attitudes toward supervisors.	More favorable attitudes toward supervisors.
7. Lower motivation to work hard on behalf of kids.	Higher motivation to work harder on behalf of kids.

And His School Will Attain:

a. Less performance from teacher.	Greater performance from teacher.
b. Less performance from students.	Greater performance from students.
c. Higher absence and turnover rates for teacher.	Lower absence and turnover rates for teacher.

d.	Higher absence and dropout rates for students.	Lower absence and dropout rates for students.
e.	Poor labor relations.	Improved labor relations.
f.	Poor school-community relations.	Improved school community relations

Adopted from Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 67, and from Thomas Sergiovanni and Robert [illegible]arratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1971, Ch. 2.

Please take a moment or two later this afternoon or perhaps this evening to fill out the Profile of Organizational Characteristics. You might wish to respond to each item twice; the first time describing the "way it is," and the second time, the way you would like it to be. I think that you will find it to be an enjoyable experience and one which will provide you first hand with what objectives for supervisors ought to look like.

TJS:sn
11-5-71